BEFORE THE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

In the Matter of the Application regarding the Conversion and Acquisition of Control of Premera Blue Cross and its Affiliates.

No. G 02-45

PREMERA'S RESPONSE TO WSMA'S REPLY RE DISCLOSURE OF AEO MATERIALS TO WSMA'S EXPERTS

In its Reply Brief, the Washington State Medical Association ("WSMA") has once again only provided unsupported assertions by its attorneys in place of any evidence establishing its position. Moreover, the Reply Brief does not advance the arguments regarding the motion in any material way.

1. It's true that Premera does not question that the two gentlemen are trustworthy individuals. But no one can look at Attorneys' Eyes Only ("AEO") Material and not have it have an impact, consciously or subconsciously, on one's analysis and on the actions that one takes or decides not to take.

To just give a few examples: Dr. Collins, as an individual physician, as a member of his group, and as a leader of his organization, will face many situations in which his knowledge of Premera's AEO Materials will inevitably give him an advantage in assessing what Premera's bottom line position -- as opposed to its bargaining position -- in a given matter is. So too with Mr. Perna, whose very job is to report to WSMA's PREMERA'S RESPONSE TO WSMA'S REPLY RE DISCLOSURE OF AEO MATERIALS TO WSMA'S EXPERTS - 1

COPY

K:\34458\00009\TEK\TEK P238S

19³

members on what is and is not important about an initiative or other action that Premera has announced. When asked to opine as to what Premera is or is not likely to do in the upcoming year in any particular area, how can Dr. Collins's and Mr. Perna's answers not be informed -- and tainted -- by having in their heads crucial information about Premera's finances, operational plans and business plans?

- 2. The answer to WSMA's rhetorical question -- will its experts be allowed to view AEO information about the Conversion -- is: yes, so long as they are not officers or employees or otherwise connected to WSMA.
- 3. Now is not the time to argue about whether Premera's use of the AEO designation is correct. But, to the extent that any of the AEO Materials have already appeared on Premera's web site, Dr. Collins and Mr. Perna presumably have already had a chance to look at such materials.
- 4. After all is said and done, the Commissioner's Fourth Order still clearly limits the scope of what WSMA's contribution will be at the Hearing. However, the Special Master and Premera continue to be in the dark as to how <u>any</u> of the AEO Materials in the OIC Staff Consultant Reports are relevant to, or needed for, Dr. Collins and Mr. Perna to prepare their reports.
- 5. "Take it or leave it" is an inflammatory, and inaccurate, way to describe what Premera does in rolling out its proposed fee schedules to its providers. In fact, that rollout actually illustrates how access to Premera's AEO Materials will inevitably be used. One can see Dr. Collins and Mr. Perna at those rollout meetings asking questions about the need for a particular fee schedule, which questions are informed, for example, by their knowledge of what Premera's target margin rates are as a result of their having seen those rates in an AEO document.

PREMERA'S RESPONSE TO WSMA'S REPLY RE DISCLOSURE OF AEO MATERIALS TO WSMA'S EXPERTS - 2

6. If Dr. Collins can attest to the impact Premera's acquisition of MSC has had in Eastern Washington, that makes him a fact witness, with anecdotal information, but it does not make him an anti-trust expert. And it also demonstrates why it would be inappropriate for him to have access to Premera's AEO Materials.

- 7. WSMA's attorneys do have access to the AEO Materials. Armed with that information, they can cross-examine expert and lay witnesses, thereby representing the interests of their client. But the assertion that WSMA cannot afford to hire an expert, even if true, does not justify the attorneys being authorized to give AEO Materials to their client's officers and employees.
- 8. Dr. Collins and Mr. Perna can submit their expert reports on November 10th. They just can't look at AEO Materials in preparing those reports.
- 9. WSMA's attorneys should have known for months that Premera would object to having WSMA's officers and employees look at AEO Materials -- why else would Premera have insisted on an AEO provision? The Protective Order was entered on June 13th. WSMA attorneys were on notice by that date that they might well need to have this issue decided by the Special Master and/or the Commissioner. They should have revealed their plan to designate Dr. Collins and Mr. Perna early, so that there would have been plenty of time to litigate the issue. Instead, they chose to wait until the last minute. They cannot now be heard to argue that they should be given more time to turn in their reports.
- 10. It appears to Premera that WSMA declined the Special Master's offer to permit it to renew, in its Reply Brief, its objections to Premera's Second Set of Discovery Requests.

PREMERA'S RESPONSE TO WSMA'S REPLY RE DISCLOSURE OF AEO MATERIALS TO WSMA'S EXPERTS - 3

25

But if a passing reference to its previous brief counts as a renewal by WSMA of its objections to some of the requests in Premera's Second Set, then Premera has the following arguments in response:

- (a) WSMA objected to that portion of Request No. 8 that asks for all documents, from January 1, 1999 to the present regarding income reported to the IRS by Dr. Collins and by the physicians in his group. This meets the test for discovery: it is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. If Dr. Collins is going to testify that Premera's reimbursement levels would be changed after conversion, then it is fair to ask how, if at all, such levels of reimbursement actually affect him and his group now, so that we have a basis for ascertaining how they might affect them after a conversion. If Dr. Collins wants to mark his tax returns "AEO," so that Premera and the Hospital Association personnel don't see them, that's fine with Premera.
- (b) WSMA also objects to that portion of Request No. 11 that asks for communications between WSMA's lawyers and its expert Mr. Perna. But one of the consequences of identifying a client's representative such as Mr. Perna as a testifying expert is that there is no attorney-client privilege between an attorney and his experts. Hence, any communications between an attorney and Mr. Perna (or Dr. Collins) should be deemed waived by the designation of each of these individuals as experts. Moreover, the courts have recognized that the work product protection does not apply to communications between an attorney and his experts, once those experts have been designated as testifying experts. Rather, the opponent is entitled to explore all of the information that was provided to the expert. See Beverage Mktg. Corp. v. Ogilvy & Mather Direct Response, Inc., 563 F. Supp. 1013 (S.D.N.Y. 1983) (work product rule does not apply to experts who are expected to testify); Boring v. Keller, 97 FRD 404, 407 (D Colo 1983) (same). In this case, because WSMA is taking the highly unusual step of PREMERA'S RESPONSE TO WSMA'S REPLY RE DISCLOSURE OF AEO MATERIALS TO WSMA'S **EXPERTS - 4**

24

25

designating the client's officer and employee as experts, all communications between the lawyers and the officer or employee must be disclosed.

(c) The third and final objection to Premera's Second Set is in regard to that portion of Request No. 8 that asks for documents regarding all communications that Dr. Collins had with American Medical Association representatives. This request is relevant to ascertain what Dr. Collins may have said to others about reimbursement levels, either now or after a conversion by Premera, both for the substantive evidentiary value of those communications and as possible impeachment of him at the Hearing. WSMA's objection is that such a request is "onerous," but no further explanation is given. Does Dr. Collins have so great a volume of communications with AMA representatives that it would be onerous for him to gather it together? Or to copy it? We find the former hard to credit and would be willing to look at these documents before determining whether they need to be copied.

CONCLUSION

Dr. Collins and Mr. Perna should not have access to Premera's AEO Materials, any more than Premera's CEO and its chief economist should have access to WSMA's AEO Materials or to Dr. Collins' AEO Materials about his practice. WSMA's motion should be denied.

DATED this day of November, 2003.

PRESTON GATES & ELLIS LLP

Thomas E. Kelly, Jr., wsba # 05690

Attorneys for Applicant

PREMERA and Premera Blue Cross

PREMERA'S RESPONSE TO WSMA'S REPLY RE DISCLOSURE OF AEO MATERIALS TO WSMA'S EXPERTS - 5

K:\34458\00009\TEK\TEK_P238S